

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

I. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the reasons set forth below.

Independent Claim 1 recites a feature regarding the realization of a tangible result, namely “**a menu screen display processing unit configured to...display** only the first subset of pieces of link information that are respectively associated with accessible linked server.” Emphasis Added. See also Claim 7 (“**a menu screen display processing unit configured to display** the current connection status of each linked server specified by a respective piece of link information included only within a subset of pieces of link information of the pieces of link information checked by the connection status checking unit **on the menu screen.**”) Furthermore, independent Claims 1 and 7 each recite a “physical thing”, namely a menu screen and a vehicle mounted terminal mounted on a vehicle, respectively. See Claims 1 and 7. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 1 and 7 and their respective dependent claims are directed to statutory subject matter.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0079028 to Kortum in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,381,637 to Kamada and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,423,892 to Ramaswamy. Claims 6-11 were

rejected as being unpatentable over Kortum in view of Kamada and Ramaswamy and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,999,754 to Hashimoto. Claims 12-18 were rejected as being unpatentable over Kortum in view of Kamada, Ramaswamy, and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0128768 to Nakano. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the reasons set forth below.

1. The cited references fail to teach a terminal that includes a connection status checking unit as presently claimed.

Independent Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a terminal that includes:

a menu screen display processing unit configured to remove a second subset of the pieces of linked information associated with inaccessible linked servers from the menu screen and display only the first subset of the pieces of link information that are respectively associated with accessible linked servers such that the menu screen does not display the second subset of the pieces of link information obtained by the menu screen obtaining unit.

Emphasis added; see also Claim 7 (“a menu screen display processing unit configured to display the current connection status of each linked server specified by a respective piece of link information included only within a subset of the pieces of link information checked by the connection status checking unit on the menu screen, each piece of information of the subset of the pieces of link information is associated with an accessible linked server”); See also Claim 18 (“reflecting on the menu screen the checked current connection status of only the linked servers in relation to corresponding pieces of link information included within a subset of the pieces of link information, wherein the subset of the pieces of link information are associated with accessible linked servers and are displayed on the menu screen”). At a minimum, the proposed combination of references does not teach these elements.

In the rejection, the Examiner first relies on the Kortum reference. However, as admitted by the Examiner, Kortum, at a minimum, does not explicitly disclose the terminal as claimed. (Office Action, Paragraph 6). In fact, Applicant respectfully contends that Kortum teaches away from the terminal as recited. First, as previously noted in the response filed

June 4, 2008, Kortum teaches displaying all of the acquired link information. Kortum discloses:

Status lamps 103, 113 become illuminated and status indicators read connected when the corresponding Internet connection is active. **Similarly, status indicators 104, 114 may also signify whether a corresponding Internet connection is disconnected or unavailable**, depending upon its current status.

Emphasis added. (Paragraph 0047). There exists no determination or processing in the Kortum to inhibit the display of any of the acquired information regarding the various Internet connections. As such, in Kortum, every Internet connection is displayed on a user interface regardless of the availability of the Internet connection's associated content. In other words, Kortum teaches away from "remov[ing] a second subset of the pieces of link information associated with inaccessible linked servers from the menu screen and display only the first subset of the pieces of link information that are respectively associated with accessible linked servers," as claimed. Instead, information obtained in Kortum is displayed regardless of whether the user can access the information or not.

Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that both the Kamada and Ramaswamy references fail to remedy the shortcomings of Kortum. The Kamada reference discloses the use of an information apparatus with an automatic Web browsing function that "allows even a user with no computer knowledge or operation experience can automatically browse the Web on the Internet continuously...." The web browsing apparatus includes an access means for accessing documents on the Internet, storage means for storing data of the accessed documents, and automatic Web tracing means for sequentially and automatically tracing link destinations according to a predetermined rule and parameters based on the link information defined in the documents stored in the storage means. (Column 4, Lines 15-25). The Kamada reference further discloses that the predetermined rule utilized to direct the web tracing operation relates to either a "depth-first" search or a "width-first" search. Kamada

states that the depth-first search is preferable when sequentially tracing the links related to the user's interests and that the width-first search "is suitable for first grasping all the link destinations in the current page and then viewing the contents of further destinations linked with each link destination." (Column 4, Lines 40-54). In other words, Kamada is directed towards a methodology of traversing the Internet. Specifically, Kamada discloses an automatic Web navigating system. Therefore Applicants respectfully submit that Kamada neither teaches nor even contemplates "remov[ing] a second subset of the pieces of link information associated with inaccessible linked servers from the menu screen and display only the first subset of the pieces of link information that are respectively associated with accessible linked servers" as recited in Independent Claim 1. See also Claims 7 and 18.

Likewise, Ramaswamy fails to remedy the shortcomings of Kortum. Ramaswamy merely discloses a utilizing a wireless MP3 player in conjunction with a wireless application protocol (WAP) network to search for desired MP3 music. Ramaswamy is completely silent with regards to providing a terminal that includes "a menu screen display processing unit configured to remove a second subset of the pieces of link information associated with inaccessible linked servers from the menu screen and display only the first subset of the pieces of link information that are respectively associated with accessible linked servers such that the menu screen does not display the second subset of the pieces of link information obtained by the menu screen obtaining unit." See also Claims 7 and 18.

Furthermore, each of the remaining cited references, Hashimo and Nakanoto, similarly fail to remedy the shortcomings of Kortum. While Applicant contends that other assertions in the Office Action regarding the combination of references are incorrect, these are moot given the preceding discussion. Thus, for at least the reasons cited, Applicant respectfully asserts that independent Claims 1, 7, and 18 and their

respective dependent Claims are patentably distinct over the cited combination of references.

III. CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and seeks allowance thereof. If Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful to resolve any issues, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Eric D. Cohen
(Reg. No. 38,110)
Abhishek Rastogi
Attorneys for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. Box 10395
Chicago, Illinois 60610
(312) 321-4200